

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/646,316 | CLARK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jeff H. Aftergut | 1733 | |

All Participants:

(1) Jeff H. Aftergut.

(2) David Bowls.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 October 2005

Time: 3:30 pm eastern standard time

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Proposed rejection of claim 23 which was the combination of Koury with Tisne

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

Koury, Tisne

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed how claims 1-22 defined over the prior art. Noted that claim 23 appeared to be properly rejected over Tisne in view of Koury and explained the same to applicant. Noted that these claims, if desired, could be later prosecuted in a continuation application. Noted that claims 27-32 belonged to a different statutory class of invention and that restriction between the method and apparatus appeared appropriate. Applicant's representative agreed to cancel claims 23-26 without disclaimer or prejudice and to cancel claims 27-32 as being directed to a non-elected invention (for which a divisional application may be filed). Noted such a change placed the application in condition for allowance and that the notice of allowance of claims 1-22 would be forthcoming..